EDITOR'S NOTE

THE FOLLOWING PAGES WERE POOR HARD COPY AT THE TIME OF FILMING. IF AND WHEN A BETTER COPY CAN BE OBTAINED, A NEW FICHE WILL BE ISSUED.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

CITY OF WATSEKA ET AL. *v.* ILLINOIS PUBLIC ACTION COUNCIL ET AL.

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 86–631. Decided January 20, 1987

The judgment is affirmed.

JUSTICE WHITE, with whom THE CHIEF JUSTICE and JUSTICE O'CONNOR join, dissenting.

The Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit held in this case that a city ordinance limiting door-to-door soliciting to the hours between 9:00 a. m. and 5:00 p. m., Monday through Saturday, violated the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. 796 F. 2d 1547 (1986). It is undisputed that the ordinance is content-neutral. The purpose of the ordinance is to protect citizens' privacy and to prevent crime, obviously legitimate governmental objectives as the Court of Appeals recognized. The Court of Appeals nevertheless concluded that the ordinance impermissibly restricted First Amendment activities because the City had less restrictive alternatives to accomplish its objectives. We have held, however, that a time, place and manner restriction is valid if it is narrowly tailored to serve a significant governmental interest and leaves open ample alternative channels for communication of the information and have not imposed the requirement that the restriction be the least restrictive means available. See *Clark* v. *Community for Creative Non-Violence*, 468 U. S. 288, 293–294 (1984); see also *Regan* v. *Time, Inc.*, 468 U. S. 641, 657 (1984) ("The less-restrictive-alternative analysis . . . has never been a part of the inquiry into the validity of a time, place and manner regulation. It is enough that the . . . restriction substantially serves the Government's legitimate ends.") (opinion of

WHITE, J.). Because the decision below departs from this standard, I would note probable jurisdiction.